

Application Number 10/788894
Response to the Office Action dated 10/25/2007

REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and the remarks herein. Applicants amend claim 1 and have not added new matter; support in the originally filed specification for the amendment "the projection protruding ... to come into direct contact with said photosensitive recording medium" is found in FIGS. 4A, 5A, and 5B and in the specification at page 13, lines 9-11. Claims 1-10 are pending.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5, 9 as being anticipated by Aosaki '359. Aosaki '359 does not suggest or disclose that the claimed "print head is provided with a projection ... protruding beyond said lens ... to come into direct contact with said photosensitive recording medium," as required by claim 1. Aosaki '359 discloses, in FIGS. 4, 11, and 24, that the print head 131 (FIG. 24) is situated to slide on the upper surface 129 of the film pack 125. The print head of Aosaki '359 is shown in greater detail in FIG. 25 and: (a) the print head 131 does not have a projection protruding beyond the lens toward the photosensitive recording medium; and (b) there is nothing that directly contacts the photosensitive medium, both requirements of claim 1.

The rejection asserts that a cutout 129a for the advance claw to enter the film pack 125 when pushing out the exposed instant film 128 reads on the protruding projection as claimed. Applicants disagree. First, the advance claw, as described by Aosaki '359 at column 20, lines 5-14, and a mechanism for moving the advance claw are well-known in the art. The advance claw is actuated to push up the bottom edge of the film until the top edge of the film comes between the developing rollers, at which point the film is moved upwards by the developing rollers. Note, when viewing FIGS. 24 and 25, that the advance claw of Aosaki '359 is not a projection protruding beyond the lens toward the photosensitive recording medium.

Because each and every element of claim 1 is not disclosed nor inherent in Aosaki '359, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(3). Applicants further assert that claims 2, 4-5, and 9 are at least

Application Number 10/788894
Response to the Office Action dated 10/25/2007

allowable by virtue of their dependence upon claim 1. Applicants do not concede the propriety of the rejection.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 3 as being obvious over Aosaki '359 in view of Anderson '501. Anderson '501 is cited for providing a photosensitive recording medium with an air vent and having notches or grooves to avoid interference with the air vent. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection. Anderson '501, furthermore, does not supplement the teachings of Aosaki '359 to provide a print head with a projection offset in the secondary scanning direction with respect to the lens, the projection protruding beyond the lens to come into direct contact with the photosensitive recording medium, as required by independent claim 1.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 6-8 and 10 as being obvious over Aosaki '359 in view of Ohba '312. Ohba '312 is cited for providing a projection formed integrally with a support member. The rejection analogizes the light source assembly 124 of Ohba '312 having a lens as the projection and the standing wall portion 122 as being the support member, *see* page 8 of the Office Action which states "wherein said projection is formed integrally with said support member (i.e., by assembling the light source assembly 124 to the standing wall portion 122, the laser diode and the collimator lens are attached in predetermined positions of the light source unit). Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Ohba '312, moreover, simply does not provide the teachings to complete Aosaki '359 to provide a print head with a projection coming into direct contact with the photosensitive recording medium, as required by claim 1; in fact, neither Aosaki '359 nor Ohba '312 provide a print head having a projection coming into direct contact with the photosensitive recording medium. Applicants, furthermore, do not understand the rejection of claims 6-8 and 10: on one hand, the rejection of claim 1 equates the advance claw of Aosaki '359 with the projection but, on the other hand, the rejection of claim 6 equates the light source assembly 124 of Ohba '312 with the projection. The rejection must

Application Number 10/788894

Response to the Office Action dated 10/25/2007

fail because Aosaki '359 and Obha '312 cannot be combined as set forth and, in any event, the alleged combination does not realize the claimed arrangement of claim 1.

No reference cited by the Examiner, moreover, recognizes the problem addressed by Applicants' claimed invention. The direct contact of the projection onto the photosensitive recording medium of claim 1, *inter alia*, eliminates waviness that occurs in the thin and soft photosensitive film. When waviness occurs, the distance between the photosensitive film and the converging lens is not constant and the focal point of the converging lens does not coincide with the photosensitive film so that a clear image may not form on the photosensitive film, *see* Applicants' specification at page 1, line 23 through page 2, line 3. The references cited in the rejection, in the first place, cannot be combined as proposed; in the second place, the proposed combinations do not teach the claimed subject matter, i.e., a projection that comes into direct contact with the photosensitive recording medium; and third, even if the references could be combined in some way, the combination fails to correct the problem solved by Applicants' claimed invention.

Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and of claims 3, 6-8 and 10 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn and that the application be passed to issuance. If there are any further issues that could be easily resolved with a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to telephone Mr. Douglas P. Mueller at 612.455.3804.



Dated: April 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/KO/ad